

Pila, Joshua

To: Kathy Harris
Cc: nvictory@wileyrein.com; peter_schildkraut@aporter.com; Feore, John
Subject: WT Docket No. 09-104 - Response to Objection to Acknowledgments of Confidentiality
Attachments: 09-121 09-104 Reply to Opposition (ECFS Copy).PDF

Ms. Harris,

I provide the correspondence below on behalf of John Feore.

Joshua N. Pila | Dow Lohnes PLLC

Associate

Phone: 202-776-2843 | Fax: 202-776-4843 | JPila@dowlohn.com

Ms. Harris,

We are in receipt of the Objection to Request for Access to Confidential Information filed yesterday by Verizon Wireless in WT Docket No. 09-104. This objection is nearly identical to the joint objection filed by Verizon Wireless and AT&T on December 9 in WT Docket No. 09-121. As you know, Telephone U.S.A. Investments, Inc. filed a response to that objection with the Commission yesterday. Although that response referred to both dockets, for avoidance of doubt Telephone U.S.A. hereby notifies the Commission that it intends to rely on yesterday's filing to respond to the new objection from Verizon Wireless. For your convenience, a copy of that response is attached hereto.

This response is being served on Verizon Wireless by email and will be submitted formally to the Commission via ECFS.

Respectfully submitted,

John R. Feore, Jr.

12/11/2009

ECFS Filing Receipt - Confirmation number: 20091210828026**Proceeding****Name Subject**

09-121 Cellco partnership D/B/A Verizon wireless and AT&T Inc. seek FCC consent to assign or transfer control of licenses and authorizations and request a declaratory ruling on foreign ownership.

Contact Info

Name of Filer: Telephone U.S.A. Investments, Inc.
Attorney/Author Name: John R. Feore, Jr.
Lawfirm Name (required if represented by counsel): Dow Lohnes PLLC

Address

Address For: Law Firm
Address Line 1: 1200 New Hampshire Avenue, NW
Address Line 2: Suite 800
City: Washington
State: DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
Zip: 20036

Details

Type of Filing: REPLY

Document(s)

File Name	Custom Description	Size
09-121 Reply to Opposition.PDF		172 KB

Disclaimer

This confirmation verifies that ECFS has received and accepted your filing. However, your filing will be rejected by ECFS if it contains macros, passwords, redlining, read-only formatting, a virus, or automated links to other documents.

Filings are generally processed and made available for online viewing within one business day of receipt. You may use the link below to check on the status of your filing:

<http://fjallfoss.fcc.gov/ecfs/comment/confirm?confirmation=20091210828026>

For any problems please contact the Help Desk at 202-418-0193.

ECFS Filing Receipt - Confirmation number: 20091210778077**Proceeding****Name Subject**

09-104 AT&Tand Cellco partnership
D/B/A Verizon wireless sek FCC
conesnt to assign or transfer
control of licenses and
authorizations and modify a
spectrum leasing arrangement. .

Contact Info

Name of Filer: Telephone U.S.A. Investments,
Inc.
Attorney/Author Name: John R. Feore, Jr.
Lawfirm Name (required if represented by counsel): Dow Lohnes PLLC

Address

Address For: Law Firm
Address Line 1: 1200 New Hampshire Avenue,
NW
Address Line 2: Suite 800
City: Washington
State: DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
Zip: 20036

Details

Type of Filing: REPLY

Document(s)

File Name	Custom Description	Size
09-121 09-104 Reply to Opposition.PDF		172 KB

Disclaimer

This confirmation verifies that ECFS has received and accepted your filing. However, your filing will be rejected by ECFS if it contains macros, passwords, redlining, read-only formatting, a virus, or automated links to other documents.

Filings are generally processed and made available for online viewing within one business day of receipt. You may use the link below to check on the status of your filing:

<http://fjallfoss.fcc.gov/ecfs/comment/confirm?confirmation=20091210778077>

For any problems please contact the Help Desk at 202-418-0193.

Pila, Joshua

From: Pila, Joshua
Sent: Thursday, December 10, 2009 2:59 PM
To: 'Kathy.Harris@fcc.gov'
Cc: 'nvictory@wileyrein.com'; 'peter_schildkraut@aporter.com'; Feore, John
Subject: WT Docket Nos. 09-104 and 09-121 - Response to Objections to Acknowledgments of Confidentiality

Ms. Harris,

I provide the following note on behalf of John Feore.

Joshua N. Pila | Dow Lohnes PLLC

Associate

Phone: 202-776-2843 | Fax: 202-776-4843 | JPila@dowlohn.com

We are in receipt of the objections of Verizon Wireless and AT&T to the Acknowledgments of Confidentiality filed by our firm as counsel to Telephone U.S.A. Investments, Inc. ("Telephone U.S.A.") in connection with the intertwined acquisitions of wireless assets by Verizon Wireless and AT&T from each other in WT Docket Nos. 09-104 and 09-121. For the reasons described below, the Commission should disregard those objections and permit the Acknowledgments of Confidentiality to go into effect.

The basis for the objections is that Verizon Wireless and AT&T do not believe that Telephone U.S.A. is a party to these proceedings. Their definition of a party under the relevant protective orders is an entity that has filed a petition to deny. There is no basis for this assertion. (Verizon Wireless and AT&T mention that the protective orders require people signing acknowledgments to be counsel of record, but did not dispute that Dow Lohnes is counsel to Telephone U.S.A. The Commission can, of course, rely on the representations to this effect in the acknowledgments.)

First, the protective orders themselves do not define the term "party," and the Commission's rules have no generalized definition of the term. However, the Commission's ex parte rules do address the issue, and they do not require that an entity have filed a petition to deny to be treated as a party. *See* 47 C.F.R. § 1.1202(d). The standard under those rules is that a party is any entity that has participated in a proceeding. Even in restricted proceedings, an entity need not file a petition to deny to have party status, but merely needs to have served the other parties. 47 C.F.R. § 1.1202(d)(1). In permit-but-disclose proceedings, participation in compliance with the ex parte rules is sufficient for an entity to be treated as a party. 47 C.F.R. § 1.1202(d)(5).

Verizon Wireless and AT&T do not cite any authority for the proposition that only entities that file petitions to deny are parties for the purposes of a protective order because there is none. The only authority they cite does not, by its own terms, define "party" so narrowly, and specifically refers to entities that participate in the proceeding through oral ex parte contacts as "parties." This reference, ironically, is on the same page as the language that they cite. Public Notice, *Cellco P'Ship d/b/a Verizon Wireless & AT&T Inc. Seek FCC Consent to Assign or Transfer Control of Licenses & Authorizations & Request a Declaratory Ruling on Foreign Ownership*, WT Docket No. 09-121, DA 09-1978, at 3 (WTB rel. Aug. 31, 2009).

Telephone U.S.A. meets the standard for being treated as a party under the ex parte rules, and plainly

12/10/2009

has demonstrated its interest in these proceedings. Telephone U.S.A.'s chief executive officer conducted ex parte meetings concerning issues in both dockets with the Wireless Bureau on December 4, 2009. These meetings were reported in ex parte letters filed the same day. Thus, under the Commission's ex parte rules, Telephone U.S.A. is a party.

More importantly, as both Verizon Wireless and AT&T are aware, Telephone U.S.A. has a significant and legitimate interest in these proceedings. These proceedings are inextricably connected to each other and to the Commission's consideration of the Verizon Wireless-Atlantic Tele-Network transaction, in which Telephone U.S.A. filed a petition to deny. In particular, the Verizon Wireless sale of ALLTEL assets to AT&T was part of the same divestiture as the Atlantic Tele-Network transaction, and there are significant questions about whether Verizon Wireless conducted that divestiture in accordance with the Commission's intent and about whether the two Verizon Wireless-AT&T transactions really are unrelated. Indeed, many of the questions the Commission has asked AT&T and Verizon Wireless concern those very issues.

In fact, the opposition to providing access to confidential materials in the two Verizon Wireless-AT&T dockets suggests a much different motive than concern about the principle that only "parties" should have access. Rather, it appears that Verizon Wireless and AT&T may be hoping to prevent Telephone U.S.A. from using that information to demonstrate that the concerns raised in its Atlantic Tele-Network filing and in its ex parte meeting on the other transactions are true. In this context, the best course for the Commission may be to merge the three dockets, so that a complete record on all of the relevant issues can be reviewed simultaneously for all three transactions. Failing that, providing Telephone U.S.A. with access to all confidential materials in all three dockets is necessary to ensure that it can evaluate the Verizon, AT&T and Atlantic Tele-Network responses to confirm the extent to which they conform to the Telephone U.S.A.'s experience during the bidding period.

For these reasons, the Commission should disregard the objections of Verizon Wireless and AT&T and grant the individuals who signed acknowledgments on behalf of Telephone U.S.A. access to the confidential material filed in these proceedings.

This response is being submitted to you via email and served on AT&T and Verizon Wireless by email to their counsel. This response also will be provided to the Commission via ECFS.

Respectfully submitted,

John R. Feore, Jr.

Counsel to Telephone U.S.A. Investments, Inc.